

**INTERNATIONAL ENERGY AGENCY** 

Implementing Agreement for Co-operation in the Research, Development and Deployment of Wind Turbine Systems Task 11

# 56<sup>th</sup> IEA Topical Expert Meeting

## THE APPLICATION OF SMART STRUCTURES FOR LARGE WIND TURBINE ROTOR BLADES

Aluquerque, USA, May 2008 Organised by: Sandia National Labs





Scientific Co-ordination: Sven-Erik Thor Vattenfall AB, 162 87 Stockholm, Sweden

Disclaimer:

Please note that these proceedings may only be redistributed to persons in countries participating in the IEA RD&D Task 11.

The reason is that the participating countries are paying for this work and are expecting that the results of their efforts stay within this group of countries.

The documentation can be distributed to the following countries: Canada, Denmark, European Commission, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Korea, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States.

After one year the proceedings can be distributed to all countries, that is May 2009.

Copies of this document can be obtained from: Sven-Erik Thor Vattenfall AB 162 87 Stockholm Sweden <u>sven-erik.thor@vattenfall.com</u>

For more information about IEA Wind see www.ieawind.org

# CONTENTS

## IEA RD&D Wind Task 11

## Topical Expert Meeting #56

# THE APPLICATION OF SMART STRUCTURES FOR LARGE WIND TURBINE ROTOR BLADES

	Page
1.	Introductory Note - The Application of Smart Structures for Large Wind Turbine Rotor Blades
2.	Latest results and future activities at Risø DTU within trailing edge flaps . 11 Thomas Buhl
3.	ATEF – Feasibility study for optimising Danish upwind turbine technology21 Dick Veldkamp
4.	FOCUS Integrated design of smart structures
5.	<b>Bend Twist Coupled Blades – Redux</b>
6.	Smart rotor blade technology applied to the Upwind reference turbine 51 Thanasis Barlas
7.	Variable Geometry Airfoils and Active Flow Control
8.	Advanced Controls Research75 Alan D. Wright
9.	Research Activities on Smart Sensing Technologies in Korea
10.	Active Aerodynamic Blade Control Technology for Large Wind Turbines . 95 David G. Wilson
11.	On the proof of concept of a `Smart' rotor using a traditional controller design cycle
12.	Overview of Active Load Control R&D
13.	Materials Research and Smart Blades145 R.P.L. Nijssen
14.	Smart Rotors for Wind Turbine Blades - Materials and Structure
15.	<b>UPWIND – SMA actuated adaptive airfoil167</b> Jari Koskinen
16.	Sensor Projects at Sandia National Laboratories 179 Mark A. Rumsey

17.	Smart Rotor Blade: Design and Modeling Considerations 1 Gunjit Bir		
18.	Summary of Meeting	193	
19.	List of Participants and Picture	197	



## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

## **IEA TOPICAL EXPERT MEETING #56**

ON

## THE APPLICATION OF SMART STRUCTURES FOR LARGE WIND TURBINE ROTOR BLADES

To be held at Sandia National Laboratories, May 8-9, 2008

Dale Berg, Sandia National Laboratories

#### THE TOPIC

In his introductory note for the initial IEA topical expert meeting on this topic in December 2006, Gijs van Kuik summarized the evolution of wind turbine control to the current commercial state-of-the-art; a system that utilizes variable rotor speed and the simultaneous full-span blade pitch (commonly referred to as collective blade pitch) of all blades to optimize energy yield and control the loads on the turbine. The resulting increase in energy capture, combined with the hardware cost reductions due to lower loads on the blades and attenuation of the drive train torque excursions, have more than offset the additional costs associated with the new control capability.

Numerous studies have concluded that adding independent full-span blade pitch to the collective blade pitch of the existing control system has the potential to significantly reduce the current level of fatigue loads, especially the periodic loading due to yaw and wind shear. These lower fatigue loads will result in lighter (and cheaper) blades, drive train and nacelle. The benefits of independent blade pitch control will not come without cost, however: it will involve much higher duty factors for blade pitch bearings and motors, leading to increases in the cost of those components. Nevertheless, the addition of independent blade pitch will probably be the next major change in wind turbine control.

The stochastic nature of the wind gives rise to fatigue loads that vary over a wide range of time and length scales. While pitch control can alleviate loads that are fairly uniform along a blade and that vary with a time scale of a few seconds, it cannot alleviate loads that vary with position on the blade and that change with a time scale of milliseconds. Control of these distributed, rapidly changing loads requires distributed sensors to determine the local loads, distributed intelligence to decode the sensor information, and distributed small, fast-acting control devices to modify the local aerodynamic characteristics of the blade and alleviate the loads.

As Gijs mentioned in his earlier note, the development of the technology required to accomplish this load mitigation, often referred to as 'smart structures' or 'smart technology', is an interdisciplinary development par excellence. It requires a joint effort in the following disciplines (and probably several others):

- Aerodynamics of airfoils with distributed control elements Several options are available for the adjustment of lift and drag; flaps, micro-tabs, plasma actuators and boundary layer suction or blowing are some of the control devices available.
- Actuators

The activation of the aerodynamic devices must be fast and reliable and consume minimal power. While well known options such as piezo-electric elements and shape-memory alloys offer several attractive characteristics, significant challenges must be addressed to develop cost-effective actuators that last for 20 years.

• Sensors

The sensors to determine the local blade loads must be fast-response, inexpensive, durable and accurate. Fiber-optic cable incorporating fiber Bragg gratings is one promising option.

• Control

The control algorithms for this type of control are not yet available. Fast, real-time load identification algorithms, allowing application of predictive control techniques, is a challenging task. Self-learning and adaptive algorithms will be used to design a fault-tolerant controller incorporating failsafe technology to protect the turbine if the active control malfunctions or fails. This will require a major development effort.

- Communication and power supply These links to and between the sensors, control logic devices and actuators must be highly reliable and highly resistant to lightning strikes.
- Blade material and construction The active devices should ideally be embedded in the blade material, avoiding slots or cavities in the blade surface that could lead to contamination of the inner structure. This requirement may lead to new methods of blade construction, such as the use of spars and ribs, but the cost of the blade must remain low.
- Blade design and analysis tools The tools available today are limited to analysis of common methods of blade construction utilizing centralized control. More flexible design tools must be developed to accommodate innovative blade construction and distributed control options.

Recent experimental work at Risø and TU Delft has verified analytical work showing that active devices can indeed have a dramatic effect on the loads experienced by and dynamic response of a blade subjected to unsteady wind loading. However, much work remains to be done before this technology is ready for deployment on commercial wind turbines.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING**

The objectives of the meeting are to report and discuss progress of R&D on all of the above mentioned topics. Since this area of research is relatively new (for wind turbines), many challenges and solutions are still to be discussed and tested. It is expected that the expert meeting will result in new and challenging directions in R&D due to the discussions between experts of different origin.

#### EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Compilation of the most recent information on the topic. Input to define IEA Wind R&D's future possible role in this topic

#### **TENTATIVE AGENDA**

Participants in the meeting are expected to discuss the subject in detail and give a short presentation relevant to the topic. Presentation length is usually around 15 minutes, depending on the number of presentations in the meeting.

The tentative agenda of this two-day meeting covers the following items:

- 1 Introduction by host
- 2 Introduction by Operating Agent, Recognition of Participants
- 3 Collect titles of presentations and compile presentation order
- 4 Presentation of Introductory Note
- 5 Individual presentations
- 6 Discussion
- 7 Summary of meeting

#### INTENDED AUDIENCE

The national members will invite potential participants from research institutions, utilities, manufacturers and any other organizations willing to participate in the meeting by means of presenting proposals, studies, achievements, lessons learned, and others. This means then that the symposia will be wide open, considering that it is only the second time that this subject will be discussed within the framework of the IEA Wind RD&D.

Blank page























Latest results and future activities **RISØ** at Risø DTU within trailing edge flaps

DTU



Thomas Buhl Senior Scientist Risø-DTU Peter B. Andersen, Mac Gaunaa, Christian Bak, Helge Aa. Madsen Frederik Zahle, Joachim Heinz, Leonardo Bergami, Li Na, Andreas Fisher

































	Sensor design	RISØ
Development o	of Pitot tubes:	
Measurement of	campaign with Pitot tubes	
Analysis of data	a	
development o	f "new" Pitot tubes	

DTU	Future v	vork	RISØ		
A "real" turbine					
Acoustic noise re	eduction Power production	Positi	ion of DTEG		
Extreme directiona	I change in wind direction	(fotigue)	Dimension of DTEG		
Extreme wind conc	xtreme wind conditions (gusts)		Yaw misalignment		
Blade flapwise, ex	ktreme (bending, buckling)				
Offshore Floating turbines	Blade edgewise (fatigue)	Hardware ) Yaw syste	em (extreme)		
Stand still	reiding (ratigue)				
Lightning	Negative wind shears	Main bearing	(fatigue)		
Wind farm issues	CFD Monte Carlo simulations	Gear (fatigı	ue) Sensor dynamics/hysteresis		
IEC Load case	Pitch regulation	Sensor de	lay Signal noise		
Stability Eme	Two bladed turbine rgency shut down	Foundatio	on (extreme)		













## Background 1: Results from Adaptive Trailing Edge Flap at Risø over the past 3 years

Results available:

- Wind tunnel test confirm flap functionality and profile data
- Practical experience with angle-of-attack measurements in full scale
- Aero-elastic simulations of a V90/2 MW showing improvement
- But the devil is in the details...

Pictures: A single Piezo element and below implementation on the wind tunnel model





/esta





























/estas

Detail testing








Blank page



<b>BECN</b>	Introduction						
	FOCUS, an integrated wind turbine design tool						
	Novem project 224.720.9535: FOCUS version 4 Novem project 224.720.9635: Windows-95 interface for FOCUS4						
	FOCUS 5: Internal development SenterNovem project: 2020-04-11-10-003: FOCUS 6 (2004-2008)						
	INNWIND - Innovation in Wind Energy (2006-2011)						
	Warning mode     Turbine Tiettose void       Wind cover:     7, Locs:       Knowledge     Warning mode						
FuDelft	Knowledge Centre Wind urbne Materials and Constructions						







Blacke modelling         1. Define the profiles of the blade         2. Define ines through the profiles         3. Define ines through the profiles         3. Define sections             Both e sections             Pre-bending             Sweep             Help       Queel	<b>ECN</b>	Scale, rotate and	d po the	sitic blac	on th de	ie p	<b>rof</b> i	les	into	
1. Define the profiles         2. Define institution of profiles         3. Define institution of profiles         4. Define materials         5. Define sections    Pre-bending Sweep           Sweep		Blade modelling		Farob Blac	de geometi	r <b>y</b>				_   <b>_   ×</b>
3. Define lines through the profiles         4. Define materials         5. Define sections             Pre-bending         3.2000       2.5000         2.800       2.0000         0.0000       0.0000         0.0000       12.000         0.0000       0.0000         11.2000       2.0000         12.2000       2.0000         11.2000       0.0000         11.2000       0.0000         11.2000       2.0000         2.8000       2.0000         11.2000       0.0000         0.0000       13         15.2000       2.7000         5.000       0.0000         0.0000       10.0000         17.2000       2.8000         2.1200       3.0000         1.2000       2.1200         2.1200       2.0000         2.1200       2.0000         1.12000       2.0000         1.12000       2.0000         1.12000       2.0000         1.12000       2.0000         1.12000       2.0000         1.12000       2.0000         2.0000       0.0000      <		2. Define position of profiles		Append S	hape	Inse	rt Shape		Delete S	hape
S. Define sections         S. Define sections         Pre-bending         Sweep         House 5000 2:2000 2:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         2:2000 2:2000 1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 2:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3         1:2000 0:0000 0:0000 R3		3. Define lines through the profiles		Dedius Im		Turiet felo				
Pre-bending           Sweep           Help         Qancel		<ol> <li>Define materials</li> <li>Define sections</li> </ol>		2.5000	2.4000	12.000	0.0000	0.0000	mj Snape R1	
Pre-bending           Sweep           Etelp           Long           Long           Long           Sweep				3.7000	2.5000	12.000	0.0000	0.0000	R3	
Pre-bending         2.000         3.0000         0.550         0.0000         0.0000         R9           11.2007         J.uu         J.uu         2.800         6.400         0.0000         R13           15.2000         2.500         5.700         0.0000         R13           15.2002         2.5200         5.000         0.0000         R17           21.2003         2.5200         5.000         0.0000         R13           15.2002         2.5200         5.000         0.0000         R21           21.2003         2.1200         3.800         0.0000         R21           21.2003         2.000         2.0000         0.0000         R21           Efference         2.600         0.0000         0.0000         R21				7.2000	3.0000	12.000	0.0000	0.0000	R7	
Pre-bending         15200         2800         6.000         0.0000         R11           Sweep         15200         2520         5000         0.0000         R13           Help         Cancel         0.000         0.0000         R13	I.			9.2000	3.0000	9.500	0.0000	0.0000	R9	_
Pre-bending         12000         27000         5700         0.0000         R15           Sweep         17200         25200         5000         0.0000         R15           Help         Cancel         QK				11.2000	2 0000	7.200	0.0000	0.0000	R11	_
Sweep         Help         Cancel         Qk		Dro bonding		15.2000	2.7000	5.700	0.0000	0.0000	R15	-
Sweep         21,200         2,1200         3,800         0,0000         R21           Help         Cancel         Qk		Pre-bending		17.2000	2.5200	5.000	0.0000	0.0000	R17	
Sweep				21.2000	2.1200	3.800	0.0000	0.0000	R21	-
Help <u>Qk</u>		Sweep		105 0000	1.0000		0.0000	0.0000	Dor	
	1				Help		Cancel	<u>0</u> k		
Fudelft Knowledge WMC	FuDelft						Knov Ce	vledge ntre	WM	С























































# Outline

Introduction
Analysis of design requirements
IPC and IFC simulations
Conclusions

#### 5/8/2008







#### Introduction

#### Background:

•Actively controlled local aerodynamic surfaces (like flaps) on the blades can efficiently alleviate fatigue loads





# Research questions: What are the necessary design requirements for such devices for fatigue and extreme load reduction? How important is unsteady aerodynamics? What is the load reduction performance compared to IPC? What are the issues in combination with existing controls?







Analysis of	de	sign rec	uireme	ents	
Aeroelastic simula •Modeled in GH B •Baseline configur •Representative o misalignment and •All wind disturbar •Baseline torque a •Data for tip sectio	ation lade ratic pera d two nces and ons	ns on the ed on (i.e. no ating con vo extrem s accordin pitch cor	Upwind ot active ditions i ne load o ng to IE0 ntrollers	5MW RWT load contro ncluding ya cases C	<u>;</u> I) W
Av. Wind speed (m/s) Yaw angle (d	eg)		radial	stations	
8	15	Station Nr	r (from bla	de root) (m) % r/B	
8	35		1	47.15	77.20
11.4	0		2	54.66	89.14
11.4	15		3	60.13	97.82
11.4	35				
18	15				
18	35				

5/8/2008







#### Analysis of design requirements



•Statistics for range of amplitudes for aoa and Cl •Maximum limits around nominal (design) values

0.855 Nominal 1.2175 Upper range	2.2135
1.2175 Upper range	5 5652
	0.0002
0.4766 Lower range	-0.5221
V∞=11.4	aoa (deg)
0.7875 Nominal	-0.8893
1.2568 Upper range	6.2303
0.4887 Lower range	-1.0219
V∞=18	aoa (deg)
0.2478 Nominal	-6.4995
1 0746 Upper range	4.0064
	V∞=11.4           0.7875         Nominal           1.2568         Upper range           0.4887         Lower range           V∞=18         Nominal

5/8/2008

UpWind





5



## Analysis of design requirements



#### Analysis of control requirements:

•max +-15 deg. deflection of a 5%c flap is not enough

•max +-12 deg. deflection of a 10%c flap can alleviate all disturbances

•control surface design and actuator performance will set the real max limits (saturation)



	Δ	nalv	sis of	desig	n require	ments
	Analysia	of oo	rodupo		eteedineee	
	Analysis	or ae	louyna		isteaumess	<u>.</u>
	<ul> <li>Unstead</li> </ul>	ly mot	tions: a	aoa/tor	sion/pitch,	flap/edge bending
1	• Roducov	, d frog	uonov	$\kappa = \frac{\omega}{\omega}$		1 0 0
9-7	Tieuuce	uneq	uency	2.	Ø.c	0.05.2. Vres
	<ul> <li>Unstead</li> </ul>	ly flow	v: k>0.	05	$\kappa = \frac{\omega c}{2 Vras} > 0$	$0.05 \Rightarrow \omega > \frac{0.05 + 2 + 763}{c}$
/	•Frequen	ncv lim	nits for	unstea	adiness ide	ntified
	Faralla		fue			
	•For all c	ases:	trom (	).24HZ	to 0.89HZ	
	<ul> <li>Effect of</li> </ul>	f upsc	aling:	limits s	liahtly drop	
		ootion	ofim	ortono		
_	Quantino	CallOI		Jonand	e. FSD are	as as
	•5% - 659	% of F	PSD in	unstea	ady frequer	
H	r=54.66	]				8m/s.yaw0
			Integ	Integ	ratio of	- 3-
	V (m/s)	Ψ (deg)	steady	unsteady	unsteady/total (%)	王 25- 資
The second second	8	0	0.000134	0.000235	63.56	
	8	15	0.000235	0.000051	17.99	5 1.5-
	11 4	0	0.0000000	0.000033	30.02	10
	11.4	15	0.000180	0.000037	16.85	8 1-
	11.4	35	0.000418	0.000044	9.49	05.
	18	0	0.000348	0.000530	60.38	
	18	15	0.000530	0.000070	11.73	0 1 2 3 4 5 6
= 10 10 0	18	35	0.000981	0.000057	5.53	frequency [Hz]
5/8/200	08					
			1	DIIV		K







#### Analysis of design requirements











## **IPC and IFC simulations**





## **IPC and IFC simulations**

Load reduction results:

- Quantify using standard deviation of the root flapwise bending moment.
- Normal turbulence levels:

	SC	IF	C
Mean Wind Speed	$\sigma(M_z)$	$\sigma(M_z)$	Reduction
[m/s]	$[Nm * 10^{6}]$	$[Nm * 10^{6}]$	[%]
8	1.45	1.31	-9.7%
12	1.66	1.37	-17.6%
16	2.04	1.74	-14.7%
20	2.16	1.86	-13.9%

5/8/2008







IPC

 $\sigma(M_z)$  $[Nm * 10^6]$ 

1.45

1.66

1.70

1.70

Reduction

[%]

0%

0%

-16.5%

-21.1%

13

#### **IPC and IFC simulations** Load reductions in the frequency domain: Large 1P peak. SC IFC 200 (July 150 (July 100 ) 200 IPC Effectiveness depends on frequency of the loads. Most energy in the PSD (Nm\*10<sup>6</sup>)<sup>5</sup> low frequency range Flaps have much 0.5 higher bandwidth. ncv (Hz Reduction: IPC [%] Frequency Region % of Total Energy Reduction: IFC [%] Low 88% -27.6%-34.2% High 12%-37.3% -1.2%14

5/8/2008







## **IPC and IFC simulations**

#### Effects on pitch system:

- Different approaches affect the pitch system differently.
- Use 16 m/s simulation to investigate.
  - Pitch Angle:

	SC	IFC		IPC	
Mean Wind Speed	$\sigma(\theta)$	$\sigma(\theta)$	Change	$\sigma(\theta)$	Change
[m/s]	[deg]	[deg]	[%]	[deg]	[%]
12	3.04	2.96	-2.7%	3.33	9.6%
16	3.39	3.30	-2.8%	3.58	5.5%
20	3.22	3.10	-3.5%	3.49	8.5%



• Pitch Rate:

	SC IFC 1			II	PC .
Mean Wind Speed	$\sigma(\dot{\theta})$	$\sigma(\dot{\theta})$	Change	$\sigma(\dot{\theta})$	Change
[m/s]	[deg/s]	[deg/s]	[%]	[deg/s]	[%]
12	0.28	0.26	-7.6%	2.25	701%
16	0.35	0.32	-10.0%	1.21	242%
20	0.27	0.24	-10.5%	1.21	354%

5/8/2008







15

# Conclusions

- Main design requirements, in terms of load reduction performance, are analyzed and limits are set. Key issues identified.
- Aerodynamic unsteadiness should be taken into account.
- Reasonable 10%c flap angles required for full control authority.
- Other design limitations will affect the load reduction performance (e.g. actuator capabilities, structural design, sensor s)
- Active flap control can contribute to high frequency load reduction, which is important for fatigue.
- IFC is comparable to IPC and beneficial at high frequencies.
- Distribution of control surfaces should be optimized
- Smart control generally beneficial when incorporated in existing control schemes.







# **Upcoming Experiments**

#### Rotating wind tunnel experiments:

- •2-bladed 1.8m diameter rotor in OJF tunnel
- Scaled blade dynamics
- •Active piezoelectric flaps
- •Scaled periodic and stochastic wind disturbances
- •Real-time controller
- •Beginning late 2008















# Questions?









Blank page







Outline
Introduction and Benefits of Compliant Structures
Fixed Wing
Mission Adaptive Compliant Wing
Rotor blade:
Variable Geometry Leading Edge
Variable Geometry Trailing Edge
High Frequency Vortex Generators
Flexsys Inc.



# Observations on Morphing Benefits of seamless control surfaces or shape morphing are well understood by the aerospace community since Wright Brothers Shape Morphing involves structural deformation. Yet, majority of the research in morphing has not exploited elasticity of the underlying structure. Using plethora of "smart" actuators to morph a rigid structure led to designs that are too heavy, too complex, requiring too much power. Morphing versus Actuator; Transmissions Scalability

# **Compliance Enables Morphing**

Exploiting elasticity of the underlying structure, or use of compliant structures, led to designs that are

- Seamless
- Strong and compliant
- Scalable
  - -full scale variable geometry surfaces (LE,TE) in fixed wing and rotor blade applications.
- Lightweight
- Less power
- Durable (no moving parts- monolithic mechanism)

#### Flexsys Inc.











# Weight Reduction Compared to Conventional Flap

#### A smaller chord MAC-Wing flap

30% weight reduction since a 25-30% smaller chord flap is needed for equivalent aerodynamic performance

#### Variable twist for span-wise load tailoring

Decrease wing weight due to a reduction in the wing root bending moment

#### •For military applications:

MACW flaps may not require signature reducing materials – a further saving in weight

A "ground-up" design exploiting all MAC-Wing benefits can result in an overall aircraft weight savings

#### Other Key Advantages High Rate Capable Limited only by actuation rates Materials Friendly □ Aluminum, Titanium, Composites, etc. Monolithic Flap Structure Simplifies mechanical architecture of variable camber device □ Ample load path redundancy – fault tolerant structure No gaps or hinges Zero backlash Possible Size Reduction Equivalent authority flap can be smaller Increases wing box chord




















## Adaptive Blades for Wind Turbines

Increase L/D

Reduce structural loads

Composite trailing edge flaps

Up to +/-40 deg of deflection at 100 deg/sec

Span-wise twist +/- 20 deg

No moving parts in the mechanism

Can be integrated with a different types of actuators

Blank page



































Blank page



































Blank page



























Nonlinear Power Flow Control Design: Stability/Performance: Class of Nonlinear Systems			
Power terms are sorted into three categories (for linear systems: point-by-point cancellation) over a cycle:			
	Power Generators	$\left( Q_{j} \dot{q}_{j} \right)_{ave} > 0$	$(\dot{W})_{ave}$
	Power Dissipators	$\left(Q_l \dot{q}_l\right)_{ave} < 0$	$\left(T_{o}\dot{S}_{i}\right)_{ave}$
	Reversible/Conservative Exergy/Storage Terms	$\left(Q_k\dot{q}_k\right)_{ave}=0$	$(T_o \dot{S}_{rev})_{ave}$
<ul> <li>Ref1: R.D. Robinett, III and D.G. Wilson, What is a Limit Cycle?, International Journal of Control, Accepted for Publication, Jan. 2008.</li> <li>Ref2: R.D. Robinett, III and D.G. Wilson, Exergy and Irreversible Entropy Thermodynamic Concepts for Nonlinear Control Design, International Journal of Exergy, Accepted for Publication, Feb. 2008.</li> </ul>			












































Wind tunnel     Blade     Pitch system	<ul> <li>Dynamic scaling (reduced frequency)</li> </ul>		
• Trailing edge flap • (	<ul> <li>Constant aerodynamic profile (no twist, no taper)</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Sensors</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>Real-time system</li> </ul>			
	Reference turbine	Experimental model	
Chord [m]	1.8	0.12	
Chord [m] Characteristic velocity [1	1.8 n/s] 54	0.12 45	
Chord [m] Characteristic velocity [1 1P load [Hz]	1.8 n/s] 54 0.28	0.12 45 3.5	
Chord [m] Characteristic velocity [1 1P load [Hz] 3P load [Hz]	n/s] 1.8 54 0.28 0.84	0.12 45 3.5 10.5	
Chord [m] Characteristic velocity [1 1P load [Hz] 3P load [Hz] 1 <sup>st</sup> flapping mode [Hz]	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.12 45 3.5 10.5 12.5	
Chord [m] Characteristic velocity [1 1P load [Hz] 3P load [Hz] 1 <sup>st</sup> flapping mode [Hz] Scaling of the dynam	n/s] 1.8 54 0.28 0.84 1 nic properties based on the 75% b	0.12 45 3.5 10.5 12.5 lade length values	











































































































Blank page





## **Presentation Outline**

- Background and motivation
- Methodologies
  - CFD
  - Wind tunnel
  - Structural dynamics simulations
- Current efforts
  - Automated airfoil aerodynamic performance table generator
  - Wind tunnel model development
- Concluding remarks



















# **Motivation: Wind Tunnel**

- Wind tunnel provides final check on numerical simulations before moving ahead with full-scale development
- For wind energy, testing is mostly 2D
  - Baseline airfoils
  - Airfoil with trailing edge devices
  - Impact of premature transition
- Questions were raised about the effectiveness on a threedimensional wind turbine blade
- Tunnel size limitations allow only for a wind turbine blade tip model
- Focus of devices in blade tip region (region where load control devices are most effective)



# Motivation: Structural Dynamics Simulations

- Conduct aeroelastic simulations of complete turbine with load control devices to investigate the load mitigating capabilities of devices
- Allows evaluation of effectiveness under a variety of wind loading scenarios
- Aeroelastic simulations conducted using FAST/Aerodyn software with MATLAB's Simulink
- Methodology applied to demonstrate effectiveness of microtabs in controlling blade tip clearance







#### **Automated Grid Generator**

- Design Goals:
  - Starting with airfoil X-Y coordinates
  - Simple inclusive input file
    - Hands off mesh generation process
    - · Default parameters for every option
    - Default override capability for more advanced users
    - · Geometry modifications
  - RANS quality mesh

CUCDAVIS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

#### **Mesh Generation Capability**

- Ability to create both C- and O-grid
- Surface smoothing and redistribution
- User specified Reynolds number
  - Wall spacing customization for various turbulence models
- TE gap detection and closure
- Multiple wake cut options
  - Wake smoothing
  - Wake angle
- Multiple smoothing parameter defaults









# Example: DU96-W-180 with Plain Flap

<ul> <li>User Specification</li> </ul>	• Input F	ile
- Coordinates: DU96.dat	→ <u>-i</u>	DU96.dat
<ul> <li>Grid output file, DU96grid.in</li> </ul>	-0	DU96grid.in
– C-Mesh –	-mode	0
– 201 Surface points ————————————————————————————————————		201
<ul> <li>Reynolds Number 1,000,000</li> </ul>	-r	1000000
– LE Spacing = 1E-3 ————————————————————————————————————	-le	0.0010
– TE Spacing = 5E-4 ————————————————————————————————————	-te	0.0005
– Plain Flap	→ -flap	1
– X-Hinge Location x/c = 0.8	→ -xf	0.8
– Y-Hinge Location at y/c = 0.0	→ -yf	0
<ul> <li>Flap Deflection Angle = -15° —</li> </ul>	→-def	-15
UC DAVIS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING		



















### **Flow Solver**

- ARC2D
  - Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes flow solver
  - Spalart/Almaras turbulence model
  - Two calculation modes
    - Steady-state
    - Time-accurate
  - Multiple numerical schemes
  - Mesh sequencing
  - Calculation restart capability









- Design, manufacture, and test microtab aerodynamic load control system
  - Actuation system will be fully contained within the airfoil model
    - Last 30% chord is a reasonable goal
  - Numerous tabs lining both pressure and suction side of model
    - Fully controllable (Individual and sets of tabs)
  - Wind tunnel testing can include steady and unsteady cases with this design










## **Concluding Remarks**

- Multi-prong effort to RD&D aerodynamic load control system for wind turbine blades
- Fast force response times show the promise of an effective small tab- or flap-based load-control system
- Small tabs and flaps show similar transient behavior
- Computational fluid dynamics continues to play a critical role in the research and development of this blade load control concept
- Extensive wind tunnel testing has verified the effectiveness of the concept
- Aeroelastic simulations of the effect of the tabs in conjunction with a simple control algorithm demonstrate favorable impact on blade tip deflections

CUC DAVIS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Blank page











































#ECN	Subcomponent philosophy
	Subcomponent research to
	Verify material model compatibility in structure
	Validate and refine structural numerical models
	<ul> <li>Offer platform for assessment of repairs</li> </ul>
	Test platform for bondlines
	Test platform for manufacturing/-ed defects
	<ul> <li>Evaluate structural health monitoring techniques</li> </ul>
	Assess Smart devices performance
	Knowledge Centre WMC
12	Wind turbine Materials and Constructions



<b>ECN</b>	Further discussion	
	Questions/comments?	
	Smart devices	
	Influence on substrate	
	<ul> <li>Connections of device to blade</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Any holes required, e.g. synthetic jets</li> </ul>	
	Profit in terms of fatigue life	
	<ul> <li>Omission</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Truncation</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Accurate fatigue models required</li> </ul>	
	with respect to	
	<ul> <li>Collective pitch</li> </ul>	
1000	Individual pitch	
	<ul> <li>Control algorithms…</li> </ul>	
	Subcomponents as test beds	Knowledge Centre
Mr. Luna		Wind turbine Materials and Constructions





Blank page



Introduction Adaptive TE Integration	Introduction
Active surfaces Conclusions	<ul> <li>Presentation outline:</li> <li>Structural concepts for adaptive TE geometry</li> <li>Integration</li> <li>Possible active surfaces</li> <li>Conclusions</li> </ul>
UpWin	





















Introduction Adaptive TE	Conclusions
Integration	Rib-spar design seems feasible from topological
Conclusions	point of view: detailed study in progress.
	Integration of several developments: new material system, need for load paths (adaptive sections, sectional blades).
	Active surfaces based on TP and 'smart' materials (piezo electrics and SMA).
	Flat (2D) surface most feasible, compliant structure for 3D TE geometry.
UpWir	

Blank page














































### **Future plans**

- Manufacturing of R-phase composite with larger scale
  - Step 1 laminate with larger dimensions (max. 350mm x 350 mm, work area of heating plates in hydraulic press)
  - Step 2 adaptive trailing edge based on R-phase actuation

### • Modular structure?

 $\Rightarrow$  Connection of adaptive part to the host structure





























Blank page

























Summary of IEA RD&D Wind – 56<sup>th</sup> Topical Expert Meeting on

### THE APPLICATION OF SMART STRUCTURES FOR LARGE WIND TURBINE ROTOR BLADES

May 2008, Albuquerque, USA

### Background

The objective of the meeting was to report and discuss progress of R&D, in this field relatively new to wind turbine technology. The knowledge in this area has taken large steps forward compared to the situation that was presented at the previous meeting, December 2006.

Examples of this are the number of tests that was presented. Tests incorporated blade profiles equipped with movable flaps and/or micro tabs equipped with control algorithms and actuators. Hence, more integrated approach was reported, including materials, loads and control. This was an extension compared to meeting 2006 where mostly basic performances of materials and flap principles were discussed.

### **Participants / Presentations**

The meeting was well attended with 22 participants, representing seven different countries, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Korea, Sweden, the Netherlands and the USA. The participants mainly represented research organisations.

A total of 19 presentations were given on the following topics:

1. Introductory Note - The Application of Smart Structures for Large Wind Turbine Rotor Blades

Blade and flaps

- 2. Latest results and future activities at Risø DTU within trailing edge flaps
- 3. ATEF Feasibility study for optimising Danish upwind turbine technology
- 4. FOCUS Integrated design of smart structures
- 5. Bend Twist Coupled Blades Redux
- 6. Smart rotor blade technology applied to the Upwind reference turbine
- 7. Variable Geometry Airfoils and Active Flow Control

Control technology, loads and sensors

- 8. Advanced Controls Research
- 9. Research Activities on Smart Sensing Technologies in Korea
- 10. Active Aerodynamic Blade Control Technology for Large Wind Turbines
- 11. On the proof of concept of a `Smart' rotor using a traditional controller design cycle
- 12. Overview of Active Load Control R&D

### Materials

- 13. Materials Research and Smart Blades
- 14. Smart Rotors for Wind Turbine Blades Materials and Structure
- 15. UPWIND SMA actuated adaptive airfoil
- 16. Sensor Projects at Sandia National Laboratories
- 17. Smart Rotor Blade: Design and Modelling Considerations

## Wrap-up Items Discussed

At the finalizing discussion a number of different topics were handled. A general attitude was that this is a new and challenging area in the wind turbine research which in the future may result in more effective ways of controlling power production.

Below is a summary of the discussion.

### 1. What's new compared to Dec 2006?

- It still feels like it is a new topic. Everybody was surprised at the development and is talking about the next test. We are looking forward to what will happen in the 1-2 year timeframe when the next meeting will occur.
- What was missing was the high level of brainstorming that occurred at the last meeting. We are missing input from the aerospace industry. It is worrisome in case we are duplicating efforts (e.g., the skin can be used as pressure sensor). They (aerospace) are usually in attendance at the larger international conferences. There we gain a larger perspective and get to see more technologies; here we may be missing something, but we will only know if we attend those large conferences.

Although things are converging, it may not be quickly enough. It is easier to stick to your own area of expertise than to branch out. Some companies/research groups tend to be reluctant to fund attendance at meetings for things they are not directly working on. As such, it is important that we establish and maintain contact with those folks to ensure cross information with the aerospace industry. In order to be effective in this technology, we need to get input from other technologies as well, which requires effective communication and interaction.

• Perhaps we could sponsor a session at conferences that are not related to wind (e.g., AIAA), or host a wind related conference and invite people with aerospace smart structures expertise. We can provide them adequate lead time to develop a conference paper/abstract on how they would apply their technology to a wind application.

### 2. Most promising technologies

- Are SMAs less attractive today, or still attractive?
  - It seems nice that you can go down to 1HZ at least. If they could go even faster, that would be something to consider. You could also consider timing issues—like pistons in a car. Although we didn't cover all areas of smart materials (fluids, elastomers), we will see a variety of controls in the coming years.
- Which are the most promising technologies that we see in the future?
  - Reliability will make the difference and be the determining factor in the future. Possibilities are:

- Surface suction (a company is currently working this; aside from the reliability issues, you can control the drag, but not the lift).
- Rubber trailing (micro jets, MEMS)

Although this is not a topic of this meeting, it will hopefully be a continued task to address next year.

# **3.** Research needs in the future, what do we miss (sensors, materials, control strategies, blade design issues, actuators, reliability)?

- *Sensors:* Do we have sensors that meet out needs?
  - They need to be developed and have more reliability (developed for specific application). All results show that that we have to be able to react fast. It would be great to have one sensor that could cover a range of things, but that is not feasible. They have to be for a specific application. The sensor is the weakest part of the whole technology. We should encourage continuation of the fundamental work.
- *Materials:* We don't see much blade failure today. Is blade health that big of an issue?
  - As we are taking materials out of blades, we are pushing the limit on blade health in order to save costs. However, in the future, we could see more issues/failures with blades because of this. We need to invest in keeping blades from failing rather than watching them fail.
  - Thermoplastics are promising and continue to be worked on. However, in Germany, we will have to pay for destroying thermoset turbine blades in the future—they can no longer be landfilled. As such, as are looking at recyclable blades (sectional steel blades are being developed).
- *Control Strategies:* What do we need to do in this area to be better?
  - We need to figure out if sensors are drifting/failing. There are always two issues: 1) are they available and 2) are they easy to control via actuation.
  - There is no way to operate at partial capacity, so we shut down when something goes wrong. We should be able to operate at other than full capacity or complete shut down. When the system is completely shut down, you are getting no production.
  - Discussion about partial control and whether the system can operate at a different level (percentage) of power. Regulations are driving what the turbines have to do, but they should be able to remain in operation for a short time after a problem arises.

\_

- Blade Design Issues
  - Manufacturing is an issue. There are some serious issues (quality assurance) in the manufacturing arena vs. what you wanted in the design (e.g., blade shape). We are learning as we go and these things are just being discussed.
- *Actuator:* Do we have the actuators we need?
  - Not yet, but we need a set of requirements for what we would like to see (such as being resilient to lightening strikes). There is plenty of room for improvement and clearly more work to be done.
- *Reliability*
- If we develop an actuator that work, we will solve the lightening problems so we should not take things off the table just because lightening can take it out. If we find something that lasts only 5 years, but is cheap and works, we should not rule it out (everyone thinks a blade should last 20 years).
- Devices should be replaceable/repairable.
- One issue of reliability is how much you can claim in design space if you have something that's impacting your design load. Cost of energy constraints come back to force the design without the controller preset—we can lose all of our gain
- Cost Issues
- We cannot come up with accurate cost estimates at this time because that could drive the technology that we end up using. We need to find the optimal solution, then start fiddling with it.

### 4. Continuation (new task, more Task 11 meetings, do nothing)?

- At this time, we are not ready to undertake a well-structured, 3-year task. Such a task must be specific and cannot be as broad as "smart structures."
- We are still in the beginning phase and we will have interesting results in the timeframe before we have our next meeting. We should continue Task 11 meetings at intervals of 1-2 years.

# List of participants

IEA R&D Wind Task 11, Topical Expert Meeting Smart Structures Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, U.S.A 8-9 May 2008

	wine
	iea

The fc	ollowing persons have regi	stered								
No	NAME	COMPANY	ADDRESS 1	ADRESS 2	ADRESS 3	COUNTRY	cc	PHONE	E-mail	
-	Mac Gaunaa	RISØ	Wind Energy Department	DK-4000 ROSKILDE		Denmark			mac.gaunaa@risoe.dk	_
2	Thomas Buhl	RISØ	Wind Energy Department	DK-4000 ROSKILDE		Denmark			homas.buhl@risoe.dk	
3	Damien Castaignet	Vestas Wind Systems A/S				Denmark	45	40834544	daca@vestas.com	
4	Jari Koskinen	VTT	P.O.Box 1000	FI-02044 VTT		Finland	358	505 956 677	Jari.Koskinen@vtt.fi	
5	Mark Capellaro	Stuttgart University	Windenergie (SWE)	Allmandring 5B	70550 Stuttgart	Geremany	49 7	11 / 6856 - 8378	capellaro@ifb.uni-stuttgart.de	
9	Bang, Hyung Joon	Korea Inst. Of Energy Res	71-2 Jang-dong	Ausung-Ku	Daejon	Korea	82	428603485	bang@kier.re.kr	
7	Sven-Erik Thor	Vattenfall	Windpower	162 87 Stockholm		Sweden	46	87396973	sven-erik.thor@vattenfall.com	_
8	Gijs van Kuik	Delft Univ of Techn, DUT	Aerospace eng Wind Energy	P.O. Box 5058	2600 GB Delft	the Netherlands	31	152784980	g.a.m.vankuik@tudelft.nl	_
6	Jan-Willem van Wingerden	Delft Univ of Techn, DUT	Aerospace eng Wind Energy	P.O. Box 5058	2600 GB Delft	the Netherlands			J.W.vanWingerden@tudelft.nl	
10	Teun Hulskamp	Delft Univ of Techn, DUT	Aerospace eng Wind Energy	P.O. Box 5058	2600 GB Delft	the Netherlands			A.W.Hulskamp@tudelft.nl	
∓ 197	Thanasis Barlas	Delft Univ of Techn, DUT	Aerospace eng Wind Energy	P.O. Box 5058	2600 GB Delft	the Netherlands	_		A.Barlas@tudelft.nl	
12	Niels Duineveld	Knowledge Centre WMC	P.O. Box 43	1770 AA Wieringerwerf		the Netherlands	31		n.p.duineveld@wmc.eu	_
13	Rogier Nijssen	Knowledge Centre WMC	P.O. Box 43	1770 AA Wieringerwerf		the Netherlands	31	227-504927/37	. p.l.nijssen@wmc.eu	
14	Dick Veldkamp	Vestas R&D				the Netherlands			nfv@vestas.com	
15	Sridhar Kota	FlexSys Inc	2006 Hogback Road, Suite #7	Ann Arbor, MI 48105		NSA			kota@umich.edu	
16	Alan D. Wright	NREL	NWTC-3811	1617 Cole Boulevard	Golden, CO 80401-3393	NSA	1	303-895-9461	alan_wright@nrel.gov	
17	Gunjit Bir	NREL	NWTC-3811	1617 Cole Boulevard	Golden, CO 80401-3393	NSA			Gunjit_Bir@nrel.gov	
18	Dale E. Berg	Sandia National Lab	Wind Energy Technology Dept	P.O. Box 5800, MS-1124	Albuquerque, NM 87185-1124	NSA	٦	505-844-1030	deberg@sandia.gov	_
19	David Wilson	Sandia National Lab	Wind Energy Technology Dept	P.O. Box 5800, MS-1124	Albuquerque, NM 87185-1124	NSA				
20	Mark Rumsey	Sandia National Lab	Wind Energy Technology Dept	P.O. Box 5800, MS-1124	Albuquerque, NM 87185-1124	NSA				_
21	Jose Zayas	Sandia National Lab	Wind Energy Technology Dept	P.O. Box 5800, MS-1124	Albuquerque, NM 87185-1124	USA			rzayas@sandia.gov	_
22	Case van Dam	Univ.of California	Mech & Aero Engineering	One Shields Ave	Davis, CA 95616	USA	1	530-752-7741	cpvandam@ucdavis.edu	
Proce	edings will be mailed to									

	•
Proceedings will be mailed to	

roce	edings will be mailed to								
	David Witcher	Garrad Hassan & Partners	s St Vincent's Works	Silverthorn Lane	Bristol, BS2 0QD, UK	UK			david.witcher@garradhassan.com
	Mehul P. Patel	Orbital Research Inc.				SN	1	480.247.6611	oatel@orbitalresearch.com
	Xabier Munduate	CENER	Dpto. Energia Eolica	Ave. Ciudad de la Innovacion 7	E-31621 Sarriguren - Navarra	Spain	34	948 25 28 00	xmunduate@cener.com
	Kyong Nam Ho					Korea			

Blank page



Sven-Erik Thor

Thanasis Barlas

Teun Hulskamp

Daimen Castaignet Jari Koskinen

Jan-Willem van Wingerden

Gunjit Bir Dick Veldkamp

Mark Capellaro

Case van Dam

Dale E. Berg

Mac Gaunaa

Gijs van Kuik Rogier Nijssen

Thomas Buhl Niels Duineveld David Wilson

Alan D. Wright

Bang, Hyung Joon Jose Zayas

Mark Rumsey

Not inn picture Sridhar Kota